

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2005

APPLICATION NO.	F	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,383	0/773,383 02/06/2004		Salman Akram	MI22-2469	6354
21567	7590	02/09/2005		EXAMINER	
WELLS ST 601 W. FIRS		P.S. IUE, SUITE 1300		ABRAHAM, FETSUM	
SPOKANE,				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2826	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Commence	10/773,383	AKRAM ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Fetsum Abraham	2826				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	86(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	•					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 32-43 and 53-75 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) all is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner	r.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	D)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	-	• •				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive	on No				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	ed.				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Diaffsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate atent Application (PTO-152)				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper Nors)/Mail Date	6) Other:	aton Approvisor (1 10-102)				

Art Unit: 2826

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 32- 43, 53-60,62-70 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,709,878. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all subject matter claimed are discloses with the exception of minor claim organization differences such as said cavity appears in the patent in the independent rather than the dependent claims as in the application.

Claim 61 rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,709,878 in view of Seiwa (6,635,852).

The prior art discloses all subject matter claimed but the claimed multiple sensors associated with the wafer sensing process. However, the secondary reference discloses that limitation in figure 1B (see the sensors 17 in relation to the wafer 16). Therefore, it

Art Unit: 2826

would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use multiple sensors to sense temperature conditions of a given wafer since the method allows one to monitor the entire wafer specifically in large wafer applications.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 71-75 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seiwa in view of Ota et al (6,645,701).

The primary reference discloses all subject matter claimed including supporting sensing devices by attaching the sensors to a wafer (see figure 1B) to provide an ample temperature for wafer processing but could have missed to mention temperature adjustment based on the output of the sensors although the primary goal of the method in the patent seems to be similar to the claimed invention. However, the secondary reference discloses the limitation in the abstract and column 1, 15-30. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to monitor wafer temperature in process since that minimizes production inconsistencies that may occur processing out of pre-designed temperature requirements and further adjust processing temperature to yield an expected result.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fetsum Abraham whose telephone number is: 571-272-1911. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 18:00.

Art Unit: 2826

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915.

*ing∥A*braham